

## REMARKS

Claims 6-10 have been cancelled. Claims 1-5 remain in the application for reconsideration by the Examiner. It is submitted that no new matter has been added to the application.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-10 under 35 USC 101 based upon "same invention" type double patenting, citing U.S. Patent No. 6,734,234 B1 to Deardurff (Deardurff).

Applicant has amended the Claims, to cancel Claims 6-10 directed to "identical subject matter" in the issued Deardurff patent. The remaining Claims 1-5 recite a three-step process that is not subject to a "same invention" type of 35 USC 101 double patenting rejection. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claims 1-5.

Applicant has carefully studied the additional references cited, but not relied upon, by the Examiner, including U.S. Patent No. 5,075,057 to Hoedl, U.S. Patent No. 5,565,158 to Sullivan et al., and U.S. Patent No. 6,479,003 B1 to Furgiuele et al. It is respectively submitted that these additional references are no more pertinent than that reference relied upon by the Examiner.

Applicant has made a sincere effort to amend the Claims to place the application in condition for allowance. If, after considering this response, the Examiner feels that there are any issues that remain unresolved, the Examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned Attorney at 419-874-1100 to discuss any such matters. Accordingly, allowance of Claims 1-5 is earnestly solicited.